

Army has relied to a major extent on compulsory service to fill its manpower needs. It should be pointed out, however, that some form of universal registration will still be needed to fill manpower needs in times of national emergency even with an all-voluntary Army.

The resolution introduced today concludes with the statement:

"The House of Representatives will welcome for consideration legislation needed to implement the concept of an all-voluntary military force with a concurrent gradual reduction in the need for compulsory service."

In keeping with this statement it is my intention in the coming weeks to continue my study of our Selective Service System, and to introduce appropriate legislation both to make the present system more equitable and to prepare the way for the all-volunteer Army in the future.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I would like to include in my remarks an excellent editorial which appeared in the Hutchinson, Kans., News last Monday entitled, "Volunteer Army":

VOLUNTEER ARMY

President Nixon is making good on one of his campaign promises. He has instructed the Defense Department to draw up a detailed plan for discontinuing selective service to be implemented as soon as a substantial reduction in spending in Vietnam is possible.

The present draft system should be done away with. It discriminates against those young men who for any reason are unable to continue their education beyond the high school level. Those who remain in college have been able to avoid their obligation for military duty.

Manning the defense forces with volunteers will be more expensive, of course. It will be necessary to increase military pay and to add fringe benefits to attract enlistments in sufficient numbers.

Present estimates are the increased cost will be from \$6 billion to \$7 billion a year. But there will be compensating economies. Under the existing system it is highly expensive to train men who spend no more than two or three years in uniform. With a force made up largely of career men, the training bill will be sharply reduced.

The United States has had to depend on conscripts since prior to World War 2. That is considerably more than long enough. It should depend for its defense on those who volunteer for service.

WANTED: A CONSENSUS THAT SUPPORTS LAW ENFORCEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATTEN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MONAGAN) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, we continue to live in disgraceful conditions of lack of respect for law and order, resulting in the intolerable situation that law-abiding citizens dare not venture from their homes without danger of attack. We live in fear. The direct losses suffered by businessmen, individuals, and the communities of the Nation as a direct result of crime and criminals have reached astronomical proportions. The indirect losses are also severe.

We have heard a great deal about the introduction of adequate controls since last year when we thought conditions of

crime had reached their peak. Unfortunately, our crime statistics continue to reach new heights and the Nation's Capital has become one of the focal points of criminality. It is heartening that President Nixon has given attention to the Washington crime and violence problem in the first days of his administration. Since the extremely dangerous conditions that prevail here raise questions concerning the effectiveness of Federal control, it is gratifying to see that consideration is being given to curbing means of crime by permitting judges to hold in jail hardened criminals awaiting trial who seem likely to commit further offenses if released. We need more judges, we need more courts, we need more police. More than anything else we need a consensus that supports law enforcement and a greater effectiveness in coordination among local, State, and national police agencies.

Our most important domestic objective today must be the maintenance of public order and the inculcation of respect for law. I had these problems in mind during the 90th Congress when I introduced legislation to create a House Committee to study the resources available to each level of government in combating crime, the efforts being made by each, the duplication of effort, the need for additional assistance and the particular types of criminal activity faced at each level of government.

There continues to be a need for such a top level study but the need for prompt top level action becomes more acute. I feel that the House should initiate and pursue such a study, promptly make the appropriate recommendations and provide the necessary assistance to begin the work of restoring tranquility and security in the Nation.

I have again filed legislation to establish a Committee on Coordinated Crime Control, as a select committee of the House, to investigate criminal activity in the United States with a view toward determining the scope of current efforts at the local, State, and Federal governments to combat crime and the resources available to each level of government for this purpose.

The Committee on Coordinated Crime Control would be composed of 12 members appointed by the Speaker of the House who would also designate a chairman; not more than six of the members would represent the same political party.

I have in the past warned that we must place our faith in democratic enforcement of the law by strengthening our efforts in the traditional form and must repel suggestions of repression. We must keep this warning uppermost in mind as we contemplate our course of action to control acts of crime and subversion which in many instances represent a calculated attack upon our society and our institutions.

The Congress and Executive have taken some preliminary steps and we have provided some funds but it is apparent that we are moving neither swiftly nor forcibly enough and that the increasing crime statistics make obvious the need for a greater concentration of endeavor and additional expenditures to-

gether with more effective use of present and projected resources. If dire consequences are to be prevented, success in anticrime efforts is imperative at all levels of government with all public agencies working effectively and in harmony.

Mr. Speaker, I offer this resolution with the hope that it will be given prompt and favorable consideration.

Bill

DEPARTMENT OF PEACE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALPERN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, everyone of us is vitally concerned about the subject of peace. I cannot conceive in this day and age of anything that is more important to any American citizen than the question of securing peace throughout the world.

It is tragic that mankind—so successful in developing the most intricate technological devices, in discovering the most obscure and complex secrets of nature, in conquering vast new worlds through space exploration—has failed so miserably at the task of living peacefully with his fellow man. We have achieved a trip to the moon, Mr. Speaker. Has not the time come to achieve the adventure of a peaceful earth?

Surely we share the conviction that there is no easy road to peace and security. We must reevaluate our concepts of the true meaning of peace and place it in a positive frame of reference.

It is for this reason and to take a step in that direction, that Senator HARTKE and I are today introducing a bill to establish a Department of Peace, with a Secretary of Peace at its head, and to create a Joint Committee on Peace and International Cooperation in the Congress. We are joined in the sponsorship of this legislation by 58 colleagues in the House and 14 Members in the other body. They are: Senators BAYH, BYRD of West Virginia, CRANSTON, HATFIELD, INOUE, MANSFIELD, METCALF, MUSKIE, NELSON, PELL, RANDOLPH, RIBICOFF, YARBOROUGH, and YOUNG of Ohio; and Representatives ADDABO, GLENN ANDERSON of California, BELL, BIAGGI, BLATNIK, BOLAND, BUTTON, BRASCO, BROWN of California, BURTON of California, BYRNE of Pennsylvania, CONTE, CONYERS, DANIELS, DELLENBACK, DENT, DIGGS, DONOHUE, DULSKI, DWYER, EDWARDS of California, EILBERG, FARBERSTEIN, FRASER, FRIEDEL, FULTON of Pennsylvania, FULTON of Tennessee, GRAY, HAWKINS, HECKLER of Massachusetts, HELSTOSKI, HORTON, JACOBS, JOELSON, KARTH, KOCH, McCLOSKEY, MATSUNAGA, MIKVA, MINISH, MOLLOHAN, MOORHEAD, NIX, OTTINGER, PELL, PEPPER, PODELL, REES, REUSS, ROSENTHAL, ROYBAL, RYAN, SCHUEER, ST. ONGE, SULLIVAN, VANIK, WALDIE, and CHARLES WILSON of California.

The bill transfers to the Department of Peace certain existing agencies and functions of our Government and establishes new concepts for the resolution of international conflict.

The Peace Corps, the Agency for International Development, and the Arms

Control and Disarmament Agency will be transferred to the Department, as will those functions of the State Department that pertain to the specialized agencies of the United Nations.

The bill also gives the Secretary of Peace jurisdiction over the International Agricultural Development Service, now in the Department of Agriculture. In addition, this measure will establish the International Peace Institute under the Secretary of Peace.

The purpose of the Department shall be to promote the cause and advancement of peace by this Nation throughout the world. The Secretary will develop and recommend to the President appropriate plans, policies, and programs designed to foster peace. He will coordinate all activities of our Government affecting the preservation or promotion of peace. The Secretary will cooperate with the governments of other nations in research and planning for the peaceful resolution of international conflict, and he would encourage similar action by private institutions. He would also encourage and assist the interchange of ideas and persons between private institutions and groups in the United States and those in other countries. Further, he would encourage the work of private institutions and groups aimed at the resolution of international conflict.

The purpose of the International Peace Institute is to furnish training and instruction to prepare citizens of the United States for service relating to the field of promoting international understanding and peace. This will operate much like the military service academies except that its graduates will be trained for employment by the Department of Peace, by international organizations, or private agencies whose activities are related to peace.

The Joint Committee on Peace and International Cooperation which the bill creates in the Congress will study matters relating to the Department of Peace, coordinate programs, and guide the several committees of Congress dealing with relevant legislation. This committee would be comprised of seven members each from the Senate and House.

The idea of a Peace Office in the executive branch is not new. In fact, we can trace the beginnings of this movement back to the early 1790's when two distinguished Americans—one black and one white—set forth similar proposals. In the fall of 1792, in the first edition of "Banneker's Almanack and Ephemeris of the Year of Our Lord 1793," Benjamin Banneker, a surveyor, mathematician, and astronomer who was sometimes called the "Black Ben Franklin," included an essay proposing a Peace Department.

And, in 1799, Dr. Benjamin Rush, a signer of the Declaration of Independence, wrote "A Plan for a Peace Office for the United States." He advocated a Secretary of Peace to balance the Secretary of War role in the President's Cabinet.

Similar proposals were echoed during the course of the 19th century by various publicists and legislators but none of these efforts led to constructive action. There were several initiatives in the 20th

century taken in the U.S. Congress to establish varying forms of a Peace Agency.

As recently as 1955, President Eisenhower took a step in this direction, creating by Executive order, a special Peace Office within the State Department, headed by a special Presidential assistant with Cabinet rank.

The President noted at that time:

The massive resources required for modern armaments, the huge diversions of materials and of energy, the heavy burdens of taxation, the demands for years of service of vast numbers of men, the unprecedented destructive power of new weapons and the international tensions which powerful armaments aggravate, have been of deep concern for many years.

Since then, Congress established the Peace Corps; it created the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency; it extended the foreign aid programs and established the Agency for International Development.

Despite these steps, however, there is today in the Government of the United States no one actually in charge of peace. There is no Cabinet-level department working at the problem full time to the exclusion of other responsibilities.

Peace is everyone's concern and no one's job, a situation which probably explains why, despite repeated expressions of determination, we have failed to convert a peacekeeping intent into a peacekeeping capability.

We must recognize that the State Department is not, and can never properly be, a Peace Office. Every Secretary of State since Thomas Jefferson has seen his duty as Jefferson saw it: to handle foreign affairs to the best interest and advantage of the United States. And that is as it should be.

The Department of Peace, as we envisage it, will define and advance our larger interests with new techniques and new energy. It will extend to the area of foreign affairs the philosophy of checks and balances which has worked so well within our federal system of government.

The bill we are introducing is broad in its scope, for it develops new concepts, blends them with existing programs and attempts at long last to redefine our national purpose as one dedicated toward peace. It will reassure and encourage rational people everywhere, for truth slips through barbed wires and climbs over great walls.

[Mr. HORTON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

[Mr. SCHWENGEL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in again introducing a bill to create a Department of Peace, which could greatly enhance the prospects for a deescalation in international tensions. I sponsored similar legislation, H.R. 19650, in the 90th Congress, and I commend the able gentleman from New York for his initiative.

A Department of Peace, headed by a Secretary who had a working mandate to press the need for peace upon the

executive and legislative branches of the Government, would institutionalize a perspective that is urgently needed in the councils of government. It would also provide a means for Americans anxious to achieve peace to press their case upon governmental leaders. Both of these functions would expand the influence of those who seek to reduce the possibility of international military conflict.

Mr. Speaker, all Government agencies, in addition to carrying out the programs mandated to them by Congress and the executive branch, speak for certain constituencies which are particularly involved or committed to the issues with which these agencies deal. The Department of Agriculture provides a vehicle for farmers to express their views and to make their needs known. The Department of Commerce and the Department of Labor similarly give special attention to the needs of their constituencies. The fact that the desire for peace transcends established "constituencies" should not prevent us from creating a central institution which can devote all of its time to working for peace.

There is a need for a department which can speak on behalf of the peace constituency, which is steadily growing larger. This constituency played an important role in bringing about the current reassessment of our international posture. It helped to convince former President Johnson to reverse the policy of escalation in Vietnam and to seek instead a negotiated diplomatic settlement. More and more Americans are recognizing the threat to world peace which conflicts like the Vietnamese war represent and are demanding substantive changes in our foreign policy. This constituency needs to have ready access to governmental policymakers. A Department of Peace would provide that access.

In a recent series of articles published in the Washington Post, Bernard D. Nossiter discussed the plans and expectations of many of the large aerospace companies when, and if, the war in Vietnam is brought to an end. Almost all of the officials of these firms whom Mr. Nossiter interviewed showed scant interest in converting their military production operations to industrial ends which could help to solve our domestic ills. Instead, they looked forward to a steady expansion of the production of military "overkill" hardware. These industries act as a lobbying force on Congress and the executive branch. They have the special ear of procurement officers and policy planners in the Department of Defense. The imbalance of the present Federal budget—which allocates 40 percent of the total expenditures of the Federal Government to "defense"—testifies to the effectiveness of this lobbying force.

Under the provisions of our bill to create a Department of Peace the Secretary of Peace would be given Cabinet-level status. He would administer programs aimed at achieving a general peace which are already in existence, such as the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, as well as new programs which are developed by his Department. Operating as he would at the Cabinet level, the Secretary of Peace would be in a position to act as a full-time advocate for

February 6, 1969

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 857

peace and, hopefully, to offset some of the pressures placed upon the executive branch by the arms and weaponry lobby. Many officials in the Government are, of course, presently attempting to play this role. But the present arrangement diffuses these individuals among several agencies and thus diminishes their effectiveness. The creation of a Department of Peace would, by concentrating energies and resources, enhance the efforts of those working to achieve peace.

The expansion in support for this bill this year is indicative of the broad-based support for this legislation. The American people want peace. Increasingly, they are recognizing that if peace is to be achieved there must be strong institutions devoted to the development of policies which are calculated to promote peace.

The creation of a Department of Peace would constitute an important step in the creation of the new perspectives required to achieve a general and lasting peace.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, our love of peace must be exhibited openly to the world.

Mr. Speaker, I have joined in sponsoring a proposal calling for the establishment of a Department of Peace. Such a measure deserves the most serious consideration from the Congress of the United States. There are several major reasons for us to give favorable consideration to this endeavor. At present the world teeters on the brink of an abyss. It has teetered in this manner since the first atomic explosion. The arsenals of the world's great powers bulge with weapons so horrifying as to boggle the imagination of mankind. These weapons are being mass produced on a continuing basis. Their sophistication as weapons systems is matched and surpassed only by their power of destruction.

At present there is nuclear and thermonuclear hardware in existence to destroy the life of every man, woman, and child on the planet. In addition, several superstates, including our own, are working secretly on major instruments of destruction in the fields of chemical and bacteriological warfare. We hear talk bubble to the surface of the Nation's press of anthrax bombs and cholera bacilli, all to be utilized in world war.

The oceans of the world are patrolled by submarines each capable of destroying continents. Russian missile submarines are being built to match ours. Red China is rapidly moving along in each of these areas, we are led to believe.

Weapons systems are being junked which could alter the balance of power in most areas of the world. Client states of major powers play deadly little games of international roulette, not realizing that interlocking alliances can pull superstates into local struggles. Regional nationalism aggravated by miniature Hitlers and Napoleons pose menaces to all mankind. Geopolitics rules the world, and the major powers dare not allow these many pots to boil over, scalding the entire mass of mankind.

It is as essential for us to elevate the search for peace to a Cabinet level as it is for us to do the same for the waging of war. We almost worship war in the Na-

tion today. Everywhere are the signs of militarism, and they are growing. We have a Military Establishment under which the Nation groans. Billions are shoveled into the military maw, and yet it cries for more. The Pentagon and the Department of Defense are institutions which seemingly defy challenge. Shall we not create a small counterweight to them which would symbolize our Nation's devotion to peace and the highest principles of mankind?

A Department of Peace could gather all our Nation's helter-skelter efforts toward that goal into one agency which could and would coordinate these efforts. Its umbrella could shelter and nourish viable ideas and proposals aimed at alleviating tensions, just as the Pentagon does the same for new weapons systems.

This proposal does not seek to institutionalize the search for peace as a fly becomes imbedded in amber. It does not seek to fossilize peace by formalizing its search. Rather it attempts to focus the efforts of many who are wasting much of their efforts. Sanction of such a Government department would show what America really wants. It would allow the world to gaze upon our peacemakers as well as upon our arsenals. This is not a flight of fancy. For if we do not attempt to make progress on this front, we shall be doomed to become the captives of our own engines of destruction. In such a case, we shall roll down the slope of menace and over the brink of disaster into the abyss of doom. We have an opportunity to make a significant contribution to the well being of our country, the world and the future. Let us not lose the opportunity.

Men remember the peacemakers with love and those who wage war with fear. The battles of the legions of Rome are long over and forgotten. Their works of peace are recalled, enshrined, and visited. Their laws and their men of wisdom are ennobled in our memories, not their masters of slaughter.

Let is be said of America that we fought not to enslave other men, but to free them. Let it also be said of us that we strove to bring light and serenity to men's lives instead of doom and strife.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to join with 57 of my colleagues in the House to sponsor legislation establishing a Department of Peace at the Cabinet level. It calls for the creation of a Department of Peace which will incorporate the Agency for International Development, the Peace Corps, and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency into a single agency whose primary function will be to "promote the cause and advancement of peace" in the world community. It is viewed by some as the liaison to all of the multilateral international organizations, leaving bilateral arrangements within the scope of the State Department.

Another feature will be the creation of an International Peace Institute within the Department to furnish training and instruction to eligible citizens to serve in peace-related and international organization fields. The Institute will then be a prime source for recruitment in furthering the goals of the Department.

With the introduction of this bill, we have formally translated the basic desires of this Nation into action, giving added emphasis to the underlying goals of our country—the establishment of international harmony and peace.

I am heartened and inspired by the widespread support the proposal has received, both in the private and governmental sectors. Perhaps this points to a new day when a Department of Peace will at the very least receive as much attention and budgeting support as the Department of Defense.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 3 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of my special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

BACK-DOOR PAY RAISES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATTEN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. RANDALL) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, since the formation of the first Congress, we have been able to get along fairly well with the system under which Congress legislates after a free and open debate followed most often on important issues by a roll call vote so that the people may know how their elected lawmakers have conducted the public's business.

But a little over a year ago, in December 1967, the Congress decided to go underground and in the Postal and Salary Act of 1967 bound together in one package a grand conglomeration of legislative give and take. This was H.R. 7977 which subsequently became Public Law 90-206. It was a measure filled with "sweeteners". There were a lot of quid pro quos. Buried in the bill was section 225 that provided for pay increases following proposals by a Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries. This latter came to be known as the Kappel Commission. Frankly some of us discovered the Commission's provision buried in a recommittal motion which would have also set aside and rendered sterile the meritorious and badly needed pay raises for our loyal postal and Federal employees at that time.

But over all, the entire measure contained several bad features. The Commission could make its recommendations quadrennially or only once in 4 years. This meant that at least once every 8 years a lameduck President with only a few days left in his term of office as outgoing President could pass the buck to a new President perhaps of different political persuasion from his successor.

Worse still, coming at the beginning of a term of Congress, the leadership of the new Congress would be occupied with many priority procedures. New rules have to be considered and adopted; committees reorganized; staffs organized;

and remember all of this is coincident every 4 years with the excitement and time-consuming activities taken up by planning and carrying out all of the programs associated with a Presidential inauguration.

It is not difficult to see that such salary recommendations, coming at the end of a President's term and the beginning of a new Congress, make it most difficult—if not impossible—to negate or reject the recommendations. What happened this year is typical and perhaps a perfect example of the operation of the act. The President made his recommendations on January 15. Even then the announcement had already been made that the Lincoln Day recess would begin the night of February 6. Under the best conditions and most perfect circumstances, this would have left only 23 days for the Congress to consider the matter of raising its own pay.

While the foregoing is an indictment against the mechanical problems and difficulties attendant upon the commission method of raising the salaries of Congress, the courts, Cabinet officers, and other Federal employees, there are also imperfections in procedure. In my opinion that which is of much greater severity is the principle that Congress has delegated its authority to the executive branch. I submit this is not only wrong in principle; it may even be contrary to the Constitution.

Congress should, ought, and must, if it intends to demonstrate its responsibility, retain the constitutional authority granted it for considering the merits of any proposal that would adjust the salaries of Federal employees. The mere fact that our own salaries are involved should provide no excuse, reason, or justification for the Members of Congress to in any way shift, avoid, or abdicate this authority. What has happened is that there is a sort of casual procedure we have indulged in up to this point, by permitting recommendations to become effective if for some reason they just happen not to be rejected.

I am sure no one could claim as a result of our comments that we are trying to deny to any of the categories of Federal employees that they are entitled to some upward adjustment in their salaries. I feel certain that most Members would support by record vote some increase in their salaries if it was no greater in size or percent than those heretofore granted our postal employees, our social security retirees, or the members of the armed services. On the other hand, there is the unheard of 41-percent increase for Members of Congress.

The real fault and the worst complaint about the present exercise in salary increases is that it is a back-door approach to the problem. The voters in our district have trusted me enough to elect me six consecutive times as their Representative in the Congress. I recognize that trust is a two-way street. I know it is my duty and responsibility to trust my constituents. By that I must show my trust in them enough to debate for the public record the extent to which I am willing to commit myself to be entitled to a pay raise.

Over the past few years I have enthusiastically voted for pay raises for the postal and civil service employees, ranging from 12 to 14 percent. I have supported raises for members of our Armed Forces and increases for our social security retirees. It is fair to say that the same inflationary forces that justified these increases apply also to the pay of Federal judges, high officials in the Federal Government, and yes, even Members of Congress are not exempt. I happen to be a Member who has no law practice or no ownership of any business in which I can share the profits while serving in Congress. Yet, every one of us knew when we filed for office in 1968 what the salary would be. It is interesting to note that for the 435 House seats and the 34 Senate seats that were at stake, or for 469 jobs, there were 1,009 general election candidates and more than 7,000 primary candidates for less than 500 jobs. Yes, Mr. Speaker, every one of these aspirants knew the pay of Members of Congress.

Returning to the central theme of my remarks, I repeat once again that the real issue is not how much a Member of Congress is worth, or how much a Federal judge or a Federal department head should earn. One of the two real issues is the fiscal problems we face in this country today, and the other is the preservation of the legislative process.

On the fiscal question we should be reminded that our debt stands at \$364 billion. We may even have to raise the debt limit again this spring. Over my protest and without my support the Congress enacted last year a 10-percent surtax intended to raise \$7 billion. It now appears this tax will be extended beyond the June 30 expiration date. How is it possible to say that there exists fiscal responsibility, or for that matter, any responsibility in a procedure which raises the pay of Members of Congress by \$6 million and yet conceals from the taxpayers the names of the lawmakers who approve of this increase.

Moreover, I cannot see any way to escape the escalative effects of the raise to be approved. Oh, it is not just the \$6 million for Members of Congress. If we allow ourselves to receive a 41-percent increase, our congressional staffs will be the next to ask for a raise. Then once again all the lower-paid Federal employees, the postal workers, the military, and the retirees. If Congress gets for itself a 41-percent increase, all of the other Federal categories will feel entitled to and demand increases, and when they put on the pressure how can a Member refuse to grant these requests?

President Johnson a while back asked organized labor to hold their wage demands to the 3½-to-5-percent range. Those who then cooperated could quite rightfully now decide that they had been left out. They could without too much criticism demand that the contracts be reopened.

The really sobering thought and the question that is almost without answer is, where will it all end? Inflation increased by more than 4 percent last year. It is my considered opinion that when this 41-percent raise in congressional salaries becomes effective, it will inspire

other raises that will cause the 4 percent to be far exceeded in 1969.

If I may be permitted, I would like to return for some comment on the other major issue in this whole question of salary increases. It is a matter which is of almost equal concern with that of inflation. It is the disruption of the legislative process or the abdication by Congress of its legislative authority by creating the device through which the Executive can, without limit, commit funds for salary purposes. This mechanism not only deprives the Congress of its constitutional responsibility for handling public funds, but it places more authority in the hands of the President than can ever be justified.

I doubt if the architects of this section 225 yet realize that in the statute which they created authorizing the President to make recommendations for increases in salaries, there is not one single word to prevent him from making reductions by the use of the punitive process even to the point of elimination of some Federal posts that the President may dislike or prefer to see discontinued, but which Congress in its wisdom has not seen fit to abolish.

An entire commission or Federal agency could be wiped out or rendered totally ineffective by the simple expedient of severe salary cuts contained in a package of recommendations with a lot of desirable increases sufficient in amount and to a sufficient number of recipients as to discourage negative action by Congress, and particularly a Congress hardpressed to organize itself in the first days of a new session.

Oh, I know the proponents of section 225, creating the Commission, will say there is a sort of veto in reverse. But why go at this problem the very opposite from the way it should be handled; that is, by letting the President legislate and the Congress veto instead of the other way around? The slight power of congressional veto as it is now provided in section 225 comes under circumstances that make it very difficult, if not impossible, to exercise at the beginning of a new session. That is why I suggest that my amendments to section 225 are so important.

It is hardly a secret that I have been critical of section 225. Yet one can never criticize without offering alternatives. I do not propose to scrap or abolish completely the Commission on Salaries, because some of its functions such as study and research are of some value and should be retained. However, I have provided, first, that not 30 days, but 90 days, be provided before the recommendations become effective, in order that there may be time to thoughtfully consider the amounts of pay increases. I have also provided for the necessity of a rollcall vote before these increases can be accepted. I have prepared an amendment to section 225 to, second, readjust the quadrennial period and to eliminate recommendations from a President with less than 6 months remaining in his term of office. This provision would so adjust the timing of recommendations as to make certain that every such proposal